



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,970	04/07/2004	Andrea Bonella	3918AB-1	9550

22442 7590 03/25/2005

SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

EICKHOLT, EUGENE H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EXC

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/820,970	Applicant(s) BONELLA, ANDREA	
	Examiner Eugene H. Eickholt	Art Unit 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haghiri-Therani et al in view of Chess et al.

Haghiri-Therani et al has all the elements of the claim except for micro - perforations. Figure 3 shows the sheet having plural images 14 printed thereon. The windows are bounded by the punch lines 5. See col. 3, lines 34-37. A protective transparent cover layer is glued over the i.d. cards. See the abstract. Chess et al teaches use of microperfs 21 at col. 3, line 65 for i.d. cards. It would have been obvious to make the lines 5 of Haghiri-Therani et al of microperfs for a cleaner look as is well known in the art.. Regarding claim2, in Haghiri-Therani et al the background 3 reads on the overprinting step. See col. 3, lines 6-8. Regarding claim 2, col. 4, lines 10-12 of Haghiri-Therani et al teach punching after lamination is carried out.

Regarding claim 5, Chess et al teaches use of laser printable varnishes as a protective coating for i.d. cards. It would have been obvious to substitute the Chess et al varnish for the sheet protective layer of Haghiri-Therani et al.

Reduced thickness of the card allowing more cards in a stack is the motivation set forth at col. 1, lines 25-30 for use of the c

Chess et al varnish coating with the Haghiri-Therani et al i.d. card..

Regarding claim 5, Table 1 of Chess et al refers to use of an anilox roll at col. 8, line 22 to coat the varnish layer on. This would read on the well known in the art "anilox roller".

Regarding claim 6, Haghiri-Therani et al teaches in claim 1 a transparent cover "film".

Regarding claims 7-8, Chess et al teaches printing on a second backside layer of varnish in claim 7. It would have been obvious to print on the backside of the i.d. card of Haghiri-Therani et al to provide more i.d. information to keep the card size small. Printing on the Chess et al backside varnish is broadly in register with the image. Printing occurs by laser printing which reads on claim 8.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art cited above as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Adamczyk et al.

The nature of the overprint ink used in Haghiri-Therani et al to print background print 3 is not disclosed. Special effect inks, while more costly are well known in the

Art Unit: 2854

printing art as evidenced by Adamczyk et al. See paragraphs 24 and 25. It would have been obvious to use the background inks taught by Adamczyk et al for the background inks used by Haghiri-Therani et al where a special effect color is desired.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haghiri-Therani et al in view of Chess et al.

Haghiri_therani et al has all the elements of claim 9 except the punching line 13 is not identified as a microperforation. Figure 3 shows the plurality of cards with each image 14 being in a window bounded by punched perimeter 5. See col. 3, lines 34-37. The cliché 3 of fig. 2 reads on the decorative coating. See col. 3, lines 6-8. A protective transparent cover sheet is a glued thereover. See the abstract.

Chess et al teaches punched lines 21 maybe microperforations for i.d. cards. See col. 3 line 65. It would have been obvious to micro perf the lines 5 of Haghiri-Therani et al for a smoother separation and more attractive cut such micro perms are well known to create.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Buzzell.

A multilayered protective cover shown in fig. 6 is laminated to a front surface of a card 30 bearing on image of a woman. Claim 10 calls for a writing on a back surface. A writing on the back surface of a pouch within which the laminated card 30 is laminated

Art Unit: 2854

is taught at col. 8, lines 1-4. Buzzell teaches overprinting a stripe 18 over a portion of the image layer of the photograph of the woman. This stripe 18 is beneath a protective layer 20 as shown in fig. 6.

Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's request to add inventor Stephan Panigel stands approved.

A shortened statutory period of 3 months is set to respond.

Eickholt/ds

03/19/05


EUGENE H. EICKHOLT
PRIMARY EXAMINER